



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE POSITION OF WOMAN.—II.

AN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT.

BY THE DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH.

ROME classified her slaves, strangers and citizens on the Greek model, and, until Caracalla made Roman citizenship indiscriminate, the purity of Roman womanhood was as highly cherished and respected as that of the citizen women of Athens. Their position was also very similar in the early part of Roman history. Woman, still regarded as a minor by her male relatives, spent her life in her father's control and then in her husband's. That sternness, often cruelty, were her daily meed is proven by the examples of parental or marital correction applauded in those days. Egnatius, who surprised his wife sipping wine, a prohibited indulgence, beat her to death—an action which in his time gained him praise, and I have no doubt new offers in marriage, as cruelty yields so potent an attraction in the eyes of the weaker sex. Without approving of the chastisement inflicted in this case, we might say that the principle practised by Egnatius might be reinstated with good effect in these days when drunkenness, amongst women, is alleged to be working untold evil in home and on children. It would be a measure for women passed by women, and, remembering the wonderful strides made in temperance reform by a woman mayor in one of our Western States, its passage in a woman's Parliament does not seem improbable.

Then, again, Sulpicius Gallus dismissed or divorced his wife because she appeared in public without a veil; Antistius Vetus got rid of his because he saw her speaking secretly to a freed woman in public, and P. Sempronius Sophus sent his away because she went to the public games without informing him. One cannot help wondering if such stern rectitude on the husband's

side was born of a desire to appear the strict disciplinarian and upright supporter of the law, or whether there was not some petty ire or strong dislike actuating him. Obedience, however, appears to have been the *sine qua non* of a wife's existence.

As law and popular opinion encouraged injustice and coercion in one sex, the other was driven to measures of stealth and violence to safeguard their interests and ensure themselves security of life. The Roman matron was not cast in the meek and placid mould of her Athenian sister. The lightning of her anger and the thunder of her revolt worked secretly and surely like a storm obscured by a cloud. In the year 331 B.C. many prominent Roman citizens were attacked by an unknown disease, and nearly all died. It was impossible to discover the cause until a maid-servant went to a curule ædile and explained the nature of the plague. She was brought before the consuls, who determined to prove the veracity of the servant's statement, and were by her conducted to a house where twenty matrons were found in the act of compounding poisons. When faced by their accusers, they at once denied the truth of the allegation, and after a moment's secret conversation, the twenty matrons boldly drank their concoction and promptly died. One hundred and seventy were found to have taken part in the conspiracy. Another similar occurrence took place in the year 180 B.C., and death by poison became the favorite revenge on a ferocious or undesirable husband. In Athens, the state had collapsed because the meekness of the wives had permitted an uneven disposal of parental authority and an improper relationship of vice and control, the foreign women having in time usurped all authority and caused a state of instability of impossible duration. In Rome, on the contrary, woman took the remedy into her own hands; and, although she gained freedom and many privileges, because men realized that they responded to whatever treatment they received, yet in the end these violent measures helped to precipitate a state of chaos, licentiousness and cruelty unequalled in the history of the world. Like unto the Greeks, the Romans were prone to religious fervor; and new religions, with attendant novelties of rites, always awakened the greatest excitement and enthusiasm. It was natural that this should be especially so amongst women, because the period of Bacchanalian festivals and the feasts to the various gods and goddesses were their

only times of liberty and enjoyment. The more they could be added to the better, and the arrival of a new worship did not proscribe the continuance of an old. The Bacchanalia introduced in Etruria in 186 B.C. created orgies of the wildest, most exuberant description. Men and women, for once allowed to mingle freely under cover of the night and in the name of religion, danced and sang in hilarious gaiety, and one can well imagine that woman's enforced passivity must have availed itself with frantic glee of this period of liberty. Whether the immorality adduced against these festivals really existed we cannot tell; that the Consul saw fit to order their discontinuance and to punish the worshippers with imprisonment for the males and restitution to their families for the women is all we know. There were over seven thousand engaged in these relaxations. Again the worship of *Tis* and of the *Idæan Mother* greatly enthused the Roman matrons, and they had ceremonies to their own female deities where no male was allowed and at which they were supreme in authority. It is easy to see that woman made religion an instrument for obtaining the liberty she so strongly desired.

As time went on, the Roman matron won a position of dignity and importance. Her good-will and restrained moderation urged the men to confer certain privileges on their wives and to allow them absolute liberty and the place of honor in the house. Roman ladies, therefore, were allowed to go out unveiled, to attend the games, to dine with their lords and to hold counsel and meetings amongst themselves. On many occasions it is recorded that, by their agitation and incessant demands, they even obtained the reversal of a law especially aimed at their privileges. We can find a parallel to the elicitation *Miss Pankhurst* managed to secure from the Prime Minister on the probable date of the introduction of a clause providing for woman's enfranchisement in the next general redistribution of votes bill in *Hortensia*, the daughter of the famous orator *Hortensius*. Fourteen hundred of the richest women in Rome had been ordered to make a statement of their wealth by the *Triumvirs*, who claimed that they had the power to employ any portion of it they liked to pay off the expenses of a war which could not otherwise be met. The matrons resented such high-handed treatment, and, as they could find no man bold enough to plead their cause, determined to do so themselves.

First of all, they approached the sister of Tetarianus and the mother and the wife of Antony. The first two gave them a kindly reception, but Fulvia, Antony's wife, drove them from the door—very much the same treatment accorded to Miss Pankhurst, who promptly retaliated by what in suffragette language is called a "demonstration," with the consequent penalty of fine or imprisonment. The Roman matrons similarly insulted turned to the tribunal of the Triumvirs. Hortensia spoke in their name, and delivered an eloquent and powerful speech which is highly praised by the great Latin critic Quintilian, and she succeeded in getting the demands of the Triumvirs reduced to a comparatively small sum. Another instance of their success occurred when it was proposed to abrogate the law imposed in 215 B.C. by Oppius to the effect that no woman should be allowed to possess more than a half-ounce of gold, to wear a parti-colored garment, to ride in a chariot within the city of Rome or a town occupied by Roman citizens, or within a mile of their palaces except for religious purposes. No one knows why Oppius had proposed this law, as women had had the permission to ride in chariots granted them in 392 B.C., at the time of the Gallic Invasion, as a recognition of the service they rendered the State on that occasion in offering all their gold and ornaments to pay the ransom demanded by the Gauls. When the abrogation of the law was proposed by L. Valerius, the Tribune, the women did all in their power to counteract the opposition brought to bear upon them by Cato and those unfriendly to the gentler sex. It was made the occasion for the general canvassing of citizens; women neglected their households and went forth into the streets and public places to assail every man they met and ask for his vote; they held secret deliberations and public meetings; they called in aid from neighboring towns and villages, and women for the nonce seemed to flood Rome. It must have been a scene very similar, in the excitement and intense agitation it produced, to a modern election. Cato, the ugly, obstinate, red-haired Cato, led the opposition, Valerius was the woman's champion. Livy describes their respective speeches, and we regret to note that Cato's is the more forcible. We certainly think women cannot have been satisfied with the frivolous and empty plea Valerius put forth on their behalf, but their tactics had, at any rate, been successful. On the day the law was to be discussed, they rose at dawn

and surrounded the houses of the two tribunes they knew to be opposed to them. Whatever their entreaties, they were successful, and the obstinate pair gave way, so that the abrogation of the law was passed and women regained their privileges.

The chief cause which influenced the change in woman's position from one of slavery to one of dignity was the gradual change in the marriage custom. At the beginning, when Rome was nothing more than an agricultural community, the woman figured as an industrial asset in the family and her husband bought her from her father. But, as Rome grew into a great and rich city, the foremost in the world, families became rich, and women no longer represented means of production; fathers left them fortunes independent of their husband's control, and a class of powerful wealthy women sprang into being. Marriage became a contract between two people, and it could not be dissolved except by law. Husband or wife had an equal right of dissolving a marriage, but permission of a family council was necessary, as well as compliance with legal forms. Such a change in the relative position of woman made her a much more important factor in the family, and put her on a basis of equality with man. The fact that marriage was not regarded as a religious ceremony removed from divorce any idea of disgrace; and, if her first marriage turned out a failure, she had a fair chance of being happily married a second time when her choice would be wiser and more likely to be influenced by her own tastes. It also had the effect of making husbands more considerate and affectionate to their wives, and the period from 150 B.C. to 150 A.D. abounds with instances of happy marriages, unions in the true sense of the word. Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, Julia, the daughter of Julius Cæsar, Cornelia, Pompey's second wife, Octavia, the wife of Antony, the first Agrippina, Calpurnia, Cæsar's wife, are all examples of noble, virtuous and intelligent women, whose records show that they not only managed their own affairs wisely, but that they were helpmates and intellectual companions to their husbands; and, when opportunity arose, they proved themselves well versed in affairs of public import as well. Wives went with their husbands to the provinces and often took part in their administration, and when the Senate tried to put a stop to this the measure was vetoed, proving that their services were beneficial.

Numerous instances of their power can be adduced, but let us be content with one: "Cicero, in a letter to Athens, relates an interview which he had at Antinna, 44 B.C., with Brutus and Cassius. Favorinus was also present, and besides him there were three women, Servilia, the mother of Brutus, Tertulla, the wife of Cassius and sister of Brutus, and Porcia, the wife of Brutus and daughter of Cato. Servilia strikes in twice in the course of the discussion, and it is evident that her words carried weight. On one of the occasions, she promises to get a clause expunged from a decree of the Senate." There were many such deliberations where women were present; a mixed Cabinet would not have struck the Romans as a cause for as much ridicule as it seems to afford those opposed to Woman's Suffrage to-day. That women wielded great political power under the Empire, and even enjoyed positions of eminence and importance, is well established. Their wealth enabled them to foster charitable undertakings, to beautify their own towns and even to endow many prominent citizens liberally. In Asia Minor especially, women displayed great activity; they presided at the public games and religious ceremonies, erected baths and gymnasias, adorned temples, put up statues and contributed in every way to the enjoyment of their fellow citizens. No wonder that they were popular and rose in esteem to the extent of obtaining the highest priesthood of Asia, perhaps the most exalted position they could obtain. A Latin Inscription tells us that in Africa one woman so impressed her fellow citizens with her excellence that she was elected one of the two chief magistrates of the place. Most of the professions open to men were also open to women, but medicine, teaching and similar arts were still practised by slaves or freedmen and therefore not considered occupations worthy of a free-born citizen.

That women were allowed to hold public meetings we have seen; under the Empire these grew into a regular assembly, *Conventus Matronarum*. Heliogabalus assigned his mother a place among the Senators and built on the Quirinal a meeting-place for the *Conventus*, which his biographer calls a Senate. The matters decided there seem to have been of a frivolous and ephemeral nature, more concerned with questions of dress and etiquette than those of domestic import, and the "Senate" seems to have sunk into insignificance on account of its absurdity. Under Aure-

lian it revived for a time, and he is said to have restored to women their "Senate" and to have decreed that priestesses were to take first rank in it. Let us hope that their presence raised the nature and tone of the debates. Now, the question is whether the freedom accorded to women was instrumental in raising or lowering their moral standard. The first hasty survey of Roman life under the Empire would incline one to exclaim that it certainly produced a freedom of intercourse and licentiousness of custom seldom equalled in the world's history. But we must remember two distinct facts before coming to this conclusion—first, that the historians and comic writers of the day greatly exaggerated the vice of the age and that their writings chiefly concern themselves with the most prominently wicked and ambitious men and women of the day, that they never mentioned the thousands of good, noble women who continued the even tenor of their way and shunned the bright and vicious atmosphere of court life. Then, also, the later Christian writers took all the wheat they could find and winnowed it from the chaff, leaving the good to rot in the storehouse where they confined it, and spreading the evil in most glaring and horrible colors so as to accentuate the virtue and goodness of Christian influence as opposed to Pagan.

Secondly, we do not have to look far to find that human nature is very much the same in Christian as in Pagan days, and that the wicked flourished just as successfully under the rule of the Borgias, the reign of Charles II and James II, Louis XV and Catherine of Russia. Orgies of equal scenic gorgeousness can be found in these days, and the French Revolution and Spanish Inquisition can account for as many cruel deaths as Nero. Virtue ranked no higher among those women than amongst the matrons, and yet, they had all the beautiful truths of Christ's religion to enlighten their conscience, while the Roman women had to turn to the unattractive tenets of Stoicism as an antidote for Epicureanism. Yet in Roman history are to be found examples of virtuous and dignified women rarely equalled in any other age; and, although marriage came to be regarded as a contract equally binding on both parties and equally dissolvable by both, this did not lower the dignity of marriage because man had to be equally observant of his vows.

The Christian religion can lay claim to having done more to

establish a general standard of morality for women than any other. It was St. Paul who laid down the definite rules for women to follow. "In like manner, also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; but (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works. Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." And a definite reason is given for these injunctions: "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety." If logic availed anything where questions of such kind are discussed, one would have thought that Adam, having transgressed with his eyes open, would have borne more of the blame than Eve, who was, after all, actuated by a desire for greater knowledge and enlightenment than Adam's society seems to have provided, more especially when we remember that her desire to learn the higher meaning of life and immortality contained none of that curiosity regarding things sexually evil which has been introduced into the meaning long after the original version of the story had become current.

The injunctions here laid down, as also in St. Peter's first epistle (Chap. II, v. 1), "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear," and more advice as to the simplicity of apparel and absence of adornment indicates effacement, submission, and meekness, and a generally negative attitude—more especially intended, it would seem, as a safeguard for men rather than as a moral code for women. The consolation offered by Christianity especially makes appeal to all who are in bondage, and the direct and immediate acceptance it encountered from women, who were in great preponderance among the early converts and martyrs, proves that the suppressed energy latent in them was ready to flow into any channel that would command their powers of endurance so long subjected to man's control.

The Christian code of morals for women, as handed down to

us by the Apostles, does not add any new virtue to the list already drawn up for woman's acceptance. At the time when Christianity dawned upon the world, women had attained a very exalted place in religion, society and politics, and occupied positions of great influence, power and freedom. So that, when the new religion bearing in its wake reforms of a revolutionary and socialistic character came, it was only natural that women should throw themselves heart and soul into its fold, and for a time they were allowed freedom of thought, service and action. But in a very short time all this changed, and from that day women only figure as deaconesses and as martyrs, and the highest post to which they rose was that of a doorkeeper or a message-woman, a very humiliating change, when one considers that nearly every founder of a sect had up to this time had a woman to aid him. Witness, Simon Magus had his Helena, Montanus his Maximilla, Apelles his Philumene, and so on. But this tenet has to this day been adhered to by the Church, although women are by nature, and in practice, on the whole, far more devout and addicted to religious observances than men. The Church, by her adherence to primary statutes, has exerted a conservative influence, and imbued us with a prejudice against all that is not strictly orthodox, so that for no logical reason whatever we view unfavorably any innovation or concession to modern thought. Yet the Church, counting amongst her most ardent supporters that great body of women workers who from their very disinterestedness in worldly gain are able to consecrate their lives to God's service, should surely be the first to recognize woman's equality. Again, the Church, as guardian and upholder of the sacredness and integrity of family life, should place woman's claim to immunity on a par with man's. The Baptist and Methodist Churches are leading the way in sanctioning women preachers. The Church of England will only follow when public opinion has irretrievably set its seal of approval on the practice. There is no plausible argument against women's earning an honorable livelihood, or making a profession of Holy Orders, that would not equally apply against woman's being canonized and looked upon as a saint—yet the most orthodox of Churches has approved such a course, and in doing so has recognized woman's equality, but only after death. Lives of Women Saints and Martyrs furnish exhibitions of such truly marvellous courage

and fortitude, inspired by revelations of the most spiritual nature, that the Church could not do otherwise than recognize them. The Christian religion has always been regarded as having conferred enormous advantages on women. Outside the spiritual gain her doctrine brought to all, and the greater severity with which she taught men to regard women in conformation with her rules of sobriety and purity, it is difficult to see in how far woman's social position was benefited. On the contrary, her public life became more cramped, and narrowed to one of pure domesticity, and her influence in affairs outside the domain of the home was *nil*. The home itself became sad and desolate, and woman's position as a mother lost its pride, the joy of child-bearing being counterbalanced by the worthlessness attributed to life. This was the way in which men regarded women under the early influence of Christianity, and the rules they laid down for their observance. The duties of the wife were simple: "She had to obey her husband, for he was her head, her lord and superior; she was to fear him, reverence him and please him alone; she had to cultivate silence; she had to spin and take care of the house, and she ought to stay at home and attend to her children. The only occasions for her going out were when she went to church, or with her husband to visit a sick brother." Clement of Alexandria says: "Nothing disgraceful is proper for man, who is endowed with reason; much less for woman, to whom it brings shame even to reflect of what nature she is."

Gregory Thaumaturgus asserts: "Moreover, among all women I sought for chastity proper to them, and I found it in none. And, verily, a person may find one man chaste among a thousand, but a woman never." The testament of the Twelve Patriarchs makes a similar statement, and adds: "By means of their adornment they deceive first the minds of men, and they instill poison by the glance of their eye, and then they take them captive by their doings, and therefore men should guard their senses against every woman." "The Angel of God showed me," he says again, "that forever do women bear rule over king and beggar alike; and from the king they take away his glory, and from the valiant man his strength, and from the beggar coax that little which is the stay of his poverty."

How, then, were men to treat so pleasure-loving, vain and

godless a creature? She is to be shut up, all her hard-won freedom taken away, her privileges totally abolished. No longer is she to go out, nor to be seen at marriages, theatres, nor the public baths, nor the spectacles. In fact, she is to have no amusement of any kind, and when she leaves her home to go to church or to visit the sick she is to go heavily veiled—it must be remembered that Roman women no longer hid their faces, so that this was a return to Oriental customs. If a woman was beautiful, all the more reason to hide her. “Natural grace,” says Tertullian, “must be obliterated by concealment and negligence, as being dangerous to the glances of the beholder’s eyes.” In an age when the love of beauty was still the strongest incentive to art and idealism, how painful such an injunction must have been to women who could no longer hope to be the inspiration to works of everlasting fame. It is not astonishing that Christianity soon killed all art, as everything that gave pleasure, except asceticism, was considered sinful. And so women were looked upon as “fire-ships continually striving to get alongside the male man-of-war to blow him up into pieces.” Pretty clothes and finery of any kind were forbidden, and woman’s sole ambition was to be to occupy herself in cooking, “so that it may be palatable to her husband,” as Clement enjoins.

Now, what were the reasons that brought about such degrading conditions? They were two: first, “marriage, even for the sake of children, was a carnal indulgence”; second, “the Christians had come to the belief that the world had enough of children, that every birth was a cause of sorrow and not of joy.”

One writer interprets the wail of the infant as he enters the world thus: “Why, O mother, didst thou bring me forth to this life, in which prolongation of life is progress to death?” and more in the same vein.

No wonder that wives came to be regarded as a curse leading to misery, and as a practical proof of carnal weakness in men. No wonder that all women shared in the general obloquy and that only virgins were exempt. Widows were regarded with slightly less displeasure than wives, although their past weakness was remembered against them; still, as long as they did not venture on a second marriage, which was highly disapproved of, they were regarded as showing signs of repentance for their former indulgence. Professor Donaldson comes to the conclu-

sion that "perhaps this absence of domestic affection, this deficiency in healthy and vigorous offspring, this homelessness, may account in some degree for the striking features of the next century, and especially the prevalent hardness of heart." "If a lesson is to be drawn," he continues, "it surely is that, as with individuals there is no place like home, so with a state there is no institution like home; that a community can be great only where there are happy, harmonious and virtuous homes, and that homes cannot be happy and harmonious and virtuous unless woman is accorded a worthy place in these homes, with freedom of action, with a consciousness of responsibility, and with the right, unfettered by circumstance or prejudice, to develop all that is best and noblest in her to the utmost perfection." With such a conclusion we willingly concur. Circumstance is gradually helping woman to attain her full development, but prejudice still bars the way, not only the prejudice of men, but of her own sex, in many cases as bitterly and ferociously expressed as by the early Christian writers.

We have seen that even the advent of a new faith bearing with it promises of salvation to the lowest and most degraded, had not the effect of establishing a moral code for women other than the standard relative to man's ownership. Marriage became more sacred in that it endowed woman with equal responsibility as far as her willingness and consent were concerned and made her a spiritual partner in grace. But, on the other hand, the general attitude adopted against marriage as a lower state of grace reflected on woman, and came to be looked upon as a serious hindrance to a virtuous life. Her morals were still a mere relativity to man, honor as understood among men was never taught her, truthfulness apart from man's interest not expected. A thing is never good or bad in itself as far as woman is concerned. In the New England States women were as grievously punished for being scolds as men were for stealing, simply because scolding was a serious cause of inconvenience to the husband, and he induced the community to establish it as an offence deserving the ducking-chair. In England, as late as 1850, a man sold his wife in the market-place because she was a scold. She fetched the large sum of sixpence. Instances of this kind could be indefinitely enumerated, did space or time allow. • All we wish to establish is that woman's sense of honor

is not expected to be either logical or rational, and that its conception is purely masculine. One of the first reforms women should set themselves, when franchise enables them to do so, is to establish a moral standard for women in which every iota will not be relative to the sex question. The growing desire to be regarded as individuals rather than as women is getting strong enough in women of all civilized countries to make such a measure welcome to all, and it will do more to plane away prejudice and a certain false modesty than any amount of propaganda and agitation. Thus woman's position was not materially advanced by the advent of Christianity, but many of her former privileges and much of her influence became lost to her.

The curious hostility and lack of faith that animated men towards their wives all through the first centuries of Christianity are shown by the instructions and restrictions they laid upon them during their absence at the religious wars. The wife remained shut up in the tower of her castle embroidering some endless tapestry surrounded by her handmaidens. The very aspect of those tapestried battles, recording the valor of their lords, embroidered by skilled hands, but conceived by poor little ignorant brains with just sufficient imagination to lay low here a knight and upraise there a lance, is illustration enough of the patient reticence and ignorance of those high-born dames. Even the type of female beauty that figures prominently before the Renaissance as painted by the pre-Raphaelite is one that has meekness and docility imprinted in every line of countenance.

As far as their education was concerned, the domestic qualities were taught them, and a little Latin, just enough to read their prayer-books. The centres of learning being in the hands of the clergy, religious instruction played the most prominent part in education. Philosophy and the little science known were looked upon as inspired by the devil and shunned as his work. Compare the Roman matron's education to that of the Christian lady of the Middle Ages. Is it to be wondered at that the Renaissance embodied for woman, as well as man, that great rebellion of nature against the shackles of ignorance and coercion under which the Church had so successfully held humanity.

With the reawakening spirit of Paganism embodied in the love of the beautiful and the free, the great wave of returning sensibility swept over the globe, beginning in Italy and spread-

ing through western Europe to England. The world had at length awakened to the fact that it was living in bondage, that there had been treasures of art, philosophy and learning, before the advent of Christianity, and that their own productions could by no manner of means approach the classic ones. At once a great revival of art, architecture, literature and learning arose, and, although philosophy and science were still banned by the Church, many read and digested in private. Women were not slow to avail themselves of this new impetus towards a freedom of thought and action from which they had for long been debarred. Indeed, it is worthy of remark that at each new ebullition of thought, be it of a religious or artistic nature, woman at once uses the confusion that follows on the institution of a new order for an old to advance her own cause towards the moral independence and individual liberty she so earnestly craves. With amazing rapidity they adapt themselves to altered conditions and environments, and the great ladies of the Renaissance, famous for their learning, their wit, tact, cleverness and grace, in fact all the arts requisite to leaders of thought and elegance, became the subtle and dangerous rivals of the statesmen and intriguers of the day, defeating them at their own game, unscrupulous and daring as Machiavelli himself. What suppressed energy must have been waiting ready to spring forth the moment opportunity unbarred the gate. Thus in the van of every great movement we find woman pushing her way to the front with an ever active and efficient energy ready to serve her purpose. See in the days of the French Revolution woman casting aside all her conservative and more quiescent virtues, and assuming the catabolic energy of man to accomplish a work man himself at moments hesitated to pursue but for her enthusiastic persistence.

The existence of so much restive and turbulent energy seems to denote that woman has not yet accomplished the position she means to occupy in society, and that having engendered no actual purpose as yet she throws her activity into whatever channel is most ready to hand. The bond known as *esprit de corps* does not strongly exist among women, and its absence accounts for the fact that they have not brought about reforms to strengthen and consolidate their own position.

CONSUELO MARLBOROUGH.

(To be continued.)